



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

whether ct or $c[H]t$ is to be considered as the starting point. In this language as well as in Catalan, the result is the same as in French. If the modern division into syllables (*a-cti-vo*), OLIVEIRA 'Grammatica Portugueza' p. 141, and the simplification of ct to t in modern pronunciation, 'Grundriss' i, p. 717, can be drawn upon as proof, it would appear that ct was employed. Probably we have here a development parallel to that cited above from the Danish; $ct = \begin{matrix} \beta \\ \gamma \end{matrix} \left| \begin{matrix} , \\ o, h \end{matrix} \right| \begin{matrix} , \\ , \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \text{of} \\ \end{matrix}$ changed to $\begin{matrix} \beta \\ \gamma \end{matrix} \left| \begin{matrix} , \\ 2^h \end{matrix} \right| \begin{matrix} , \\ , \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \text{of} \\ \end{matrix}$. This $\gamma 2^h$ as indicated above was more and more assimilated to the t -position, the voice of the preceding vowel was held, the closure relaxed, and the final result was $\gamma 3^g = i$. At a later period, this same sound $\gamma 2^h$ was assimilated to the preceding vowel (it will be observed that the change of $c > u$ takes place mainly after back vowels), the closure was relaxed to $\gamma 3_j$, which is the requisite tongue position for u .

ITALIAN. Here, tt as result of ct , implies that ct was pronounced with implosive c . The process is simple; both points of articulation are brought nearer and nearer together, till at last they coincide; $\begin{matrix} \beta \\ \gamma \end{matrix} \left| \begin{matrix} , \\ o, h \end{matrix} \right| \begin{matrix} , \\ , \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \text{of} \\ \end{matrix}$ becomes γf_o , a blade stop.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

Indiana University.

JOHN CROWNE: A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE.

THE usual accounts of this author are vague as well as inconsistent with one another.

In his 'History of Eighteenth Century Literature' (London, 1889), Mr. GOSSE says:

"John Crown (1640?-1705?), a writer of mean talent but extraordinary persistence, was a rival of Lee in tragedy and Dryden in comedy. He was the son of an independent minister in Nova Scotia and was called from his prim appearance 'Starch Johnny Crown.' We know very little of his life, although from the appearance of his *Juliana* in 1671 to that of his *Caligula* in 1698, he was constantly before the public as a professional writer."

Mr. A. H. BULLEN ('Dict. Nat. Biog.' xiii, p. 243) quotes the statement that CROWNE's father was an "independent minister," and adds, "this statement which has been fre-

quently repeated, is probably incorrect, for in the Colonial State papers, he is invariably styled 'Colonel' Crowne."

MAIDMENT and LOGAN, in the prefatory memoir to their edition of CROWNE (The Dramatic Works of John Crowne' Edin. 1873, 4 vols.) speak contemptuously of "book-makers"; "following in the wake of one another they simply endorse without inquiry . . . the statement made by the original writer, copying his very words." But they do not make any effort to reconcile the conflicting statements which they quote. The prefatory memoir contains nothing that is not to be found in Mr. BULLEN's article, cited above. The *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, 1852, vol. vi, p. 47, says "we may probably claim him (J. CROWNE) as an American by birth."

The principal sources of these accounts are three in number: LANGBAINE ('English Dramatic Poets.' Oxon., 1691); the MS. notes of the antiquary OLDYS in several copies of LANGBAINE, one of which is in the British Museum; and JOHN DENNIS ('Original Letters Familiar, Moral and Critical,' 2 vols. 1721; vol. i, p. 48 f.) The substance of these accounts has been already given, with the exception of OLDYS's notes, which I now cite.

"John Crowne was the son of William Crowne, gent., who travelled under the Earl of Arundel to Vienna and published a relation of the remarkable places and passages in the said Earl's said embassy to the Emperor Ferdinand II, 1637, but full of imperfections and errors. This William afterwards succeeded H. Lilly as Rouge Dragon in the Herald's office, and was continued in 1660; but selling to Mr. Sanford went over with his family to one of his plantations and there died." (MAIDMENT and LOGAN I, x).

This much, at least, is plain from the foregoing accounts: JOHN CROWNE, play-writer and court favorite of Charles II, puppet of ROCHESTER and rival of DRYDEN, had something to do with this country. What that relation was, it is the object of this paper to make clear. In order to do so, I must open a chapter in the early history of Nova Scotia: the land that LONGFELLOW has made classic, Acadia, the land of Evangeline.

The documents which bear upon this question are contained in vol. i of the MS. records

in possession of the government of Nova Scotia. They consist mainly of copies, made in England, of papers in the Colonial Office in London and of MSS. in the British Museum. Those which throw most light on the subject are the documents numbered 55 and 62, which contain the cases of WILLIAM and JOHN CROWNE respectively; and the numerous letters of Sir THOMAS TEMPLE. A careful examination of the entire volume as well as of other authorities cited, warrants me in coming to the following conclusions.

In the year 1654 Major SEDGWICK, acting under the orders of CROMWELL, seized the French forts in Acadia. The dispossessed owner, CHARLES DE LA TOUR, went over to London soon after, and endeavored to get back his estate. The latter's title was derived from his father CLAUDE, who had obtained *his* right, in 1630, from the original grantee, Sir WILLIAM ALEXANDER. DE LA TOUR was not the only claimant. Sir LEWIS KIRKE and others, now that the province was again in the hands of the English, petitioned CROMWELL's council of state for it. The ground of their claim was the right of conquest; they had taken Acadia in 1632, in the famous expedition against Quebec. CROMWELL's council refused to listen to them because they were "malignants," *i. e.* suspected Royalists; but it was not prepared to bestow the valuable plantation upon DE LA TOUR; for, although he was a Protestant, he was a foreigner, a Frenchman. At this juncture, DE LA TOUR induced a nephew of CROMWELL's Lord Keeper, Lord FIENNES, to enter into the partnership with him. This was Colonel THOMAS TEMPLE, a cadet of that old and famous family, the TEMPLES of Stowe. His motive for preferring exile in America to residence in England, we learn from two of his own interesting letters. He "feared the fury of CROMWELL," in other words, was suspected of "malignancy," or favoring the Royal cause. We have abundant evidence that he was poor; he might mend his fortunes in America; and Lord FIENNES 'advised' him to leave the country. The terms on which the proprietors received their grant I need not relate in detail, except to mention that they were required to find a large sum of money. This they were unable to do,

till WILLIAM CROWNE advanced the two partners the necessary amount, and thereby became joint partner with them. The same year DE LA TOUR, for a consideration, made over all his rights to TEMPLE and CROWNE. And now, as the sagas say, he is out of the story.

In the spring of 1657 the two adventurers first came to the province. The date is important, because it occurs in another document, to which I shall presently refer. In November, 1658, the French ambassador at London complained that Colonel TEMPLE had committed various acts of hostility towards the French inhabitants of Acadia. From this formal remonstrance it appears that TEMPLE must have entered upon his duties of administration with great energy; but as he had done nothing which he was not empowered to do by his commission, the English Council of State paid no attention to this complaint. How is it that in this transaction we hear nothing of Colonel CROWNE? The answer is that in 1657, the year in which the two proprietors came to this country, they divided the property between them. A very small and insignificant part (between the Machias and the Penobscot) was retained by CROWNE. He immediately built a fort on the island of Penobscot and another some distance up the Penobscot river at Négué, which he re-named Crownespoint, after himself. In the three years which elapsed between his arrival in the country and the Restoration, CROWNE had established a beaver trade of such profit, that his unscrupulous partner took away by force both the trading-posts and all the goods which they contained. CROWNE was vainly seeking redress in the New England courts, when the Restoration forced him into alliance with his foe, TEMPLE.

CHARLES II came to the throne in May, 1660. Two weeks later one THOMAS ELLIOT, a "bed-chamber man" as TEMPLE calls him, asked and nearly obtained the entire province of Nova Scotia. In the same year Sir LEWIS KIRKE and the widow of Sir WILLIAM ALEXANDER also petitioned for it, and in the following year the French ambassador claimed the province for France. TEMPLE and CROWNE were compelled to unite against these harpies, or lose all. They lost no time in taking their measures. TEMPLE could not leave Boston,

he was too deeply in debt; but he dispatched CROWNE at once, with a petition to the king. Some time after, he was enabled to go in person to court; for he certainly was in England in 1662, when the dispute was settled. He was obliged to buy off the "bed-chamber man" with a pension of £600 a year; but he was given a new patent in his own name as well as a new commission as governor, and besides made baronet of Nova Scotia. CROWNE was made Rouge Dragon, a minor office in the College of Arms; and in 1663 they both returned to America. Here their quarrel was renewed. CROWNE threatened to complain to His Majesty of TEMPLE's treatment; and the matter was settled by TEMPLE leasing CROWNE's property from him. Some time passed and CROWNE received no money, and again the quarrel broke out, apparently at Penobscot. Again TEMPLE cheated his partner, giving him orders on merchants in Boston for money due to him. But on CROWNE's arrival at Boston, says Document 62, he found that TEMPLE had sent other letters, enjoining the merchants to pay his dupe nothing. In 1667, by the treaty of Breda, Acadia was handed back to the French, and in this year WILLIAM CROWNE died,¹ aged fifty. And now he is out of the story. TEMPLE refused to surrender the province till 1670, when he was forced to submit. Four years later he died.

I have found it necessary to give this historical introduction in detail, in order to make my account of JOHN CROWNE intelligible; for the fresh facts which I have discovered relate chiefly to his attempts to recover certain property in America.

The earliest mention of him proves that he was a student at Harvard. The college steward's account book contains an entry, "Crowne is creditor" for the amount of £2 2s., which is dated July 2d, 1657; and shows further that payments were made by "Colonel Crowne" in the quarters ending October 5th, 1657, and April 5th, 1659.² Nor is direct evidence wanting. In a curious affidavit³ which CROWNE

made probably in 1679, he states in a parenthesis that he was a "member of the University of New England." From this document it also appears that CROWNE boarded (his own word) in the house of Mr. JOHN MORTON, the Teacher of the principal Independent Church of Boston, and that there he witnessed the reception of the regicide colonels Goffe and Whalley, "soon after His Majesty's happy restoration."

CROWNE's name does not appear in this list of Harvard graduates, and he probably took no degree. From these facts it seems legitimate to infer that Colonel CROWNE, on coming to America, at once placed his eldest son at Harvard, and kept him there from 1657 to 1660. This gives us a clue to CROWNE's age; he must have been between fifteen and twenty years of age and certainly could not have been born in America; therefore the year 1640 which Mr. Gosse gives as the date of his birth is probably correct. It seems to be also highly probable that the often quoted statement, "the son of an independent minister in Nova Scotia," arose from DENNIS's imperfect recollection of the affidavit before cited. The matter is not of the last importance; but nothing can be more certain than that WILLIAM CROWNE was *not* an "Independent minister" or a "minister" of any kind.

The first attempt of JOHN CROWNE to recover the property out of which his father had been swindled, either by TEMPLE or CHARLES II, was in 1679. At this time CROWNE had become a court favorite and was the author of eight plays,⁴ the first of which appeared in 1671. Document 81 shows that the Committee of Trade and Plantations met at Whitehall, June 21st, 1679, to consider the claims of Mr. JOHN CROWNE on the Mt. Hope property. By this it is seen that CROWNE had given up his attempt to recover what he really had a right to, the estate in Maine, and was asking for land in Rhode Island. To this he had no shadow of right; and indeed only claimed it by way of compensation for what he had lost elsewhere. The committee would not move in the matter

¹ PALFREY: 'History of New England during the Stuart Dynasty,' ii, p. 248, note 4.

² SIBLEY: 'Biographical Sketches of Harvard University,' Cambridge, 1873. I, (1642-1658).

³ PALFREY: 'Hist. New England' vol. ii, p. 498.

⁴ It was in 1675 that ROCHESTER had made use of CROWNE to snub DRYDEN, by prevailing on the King to give the former the task of writing the "Masque Calisto." This is noticeable as the last of the masques: the chief performer was the handsome, ill-fated DUKE OF MONMOUTH.

till they had letters from New England and CROWNE had time to produce satisfactory evidence of his rights. He was referred to NELSON, TEMPLE's nephew and legatee, who also laid claim to land in America; and the matter was laid by for four months. He was very near success, however. What a stir his claim created will be seen from the following extract from a letter from E. RANDOLPH to Governor WINSLOW of Massachusetts in 1679:

"The enclosed from Crowne came to my hands at Piscataqua. By that you will easily see a necessity of speeding for court. I did not forget to signify your grateful receipt of His Majesty's letter, and being indisposed, you desired nothing done about Mt. Hope till somebody did appear from the colony. Sir, be assured Mr. Crowne will be doing, and his interest at court is not small, and considering the use there is of renewing your charter you can never do your colony greater service than to appear yourself at Whitehall, where you will very well stem his design."

The danger was so great that the Governor of Massachusetts was advised to make a journey to England to protect the interests of his colony. The Committee of Trade and Plantations met again October 30th, 1679, and reported adversely to CROWNE; the colony was to be "continued in possession" of Mt. Hope, and "starch Johnny Crowne" had a grievance for the rest of his life. The following extract from a letter⁶ of Governor WINSLOW to H. COVENTRY shows the feelings of the successful claimants. It is dated "Marshfield," May 1st, 1680.

"We doubt not of his majesty's Justice and favour in granting us free enjoyment of the lands of Mt. Hope, therein mentioned . . . but the timely receipt of those letters might have prevented y^e suspension we are under of settling them; occasioned by Mr. John Crowne petitioning His Majesty for them."

The "extraordinary persistence" which Mr. GOSSE notices as characteristic of CROWNE's

⁵ "There is some order or paper of instructions I once saw in the Harleian Library, from CHARLES II., as I remember, either to LORD BALTIMORE or some other possessors, or Governors in one of the American settlements, to enquire into, recover, or restore for or on behalf of Mr. JOHN CROWNE or his father." (OLDYS MS. notes in copy of LANGBAIN in Brit. Mus. MAIDMENT and LOGAN I, x.)

⁶ *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 1863-1864, p. 483.

literary efforts, is manifested no less plainly in his pursuit of lost estate. He was disappointed in 1679, but soon after he seems to have pleaded his case in New England, for on July 13th, 1682, three years later, we find the General Court of Massachusetts finally disposing of his claims (apparently in contempt) by granting him a gratuity of £5, "in consequence of a pathetic memorial" says PALFREY.⁷ His next disappointment was nearly as heavy. He had written three acts of his best comedy, "Sir Courtly Nice," on a plot suggested to him by his patron, King CHARLES; the incomplete play met with the royal approval, it was finished, and at the time of the very last rehearsal, the King was taken with the illness from which he never recovered. "Sir Courtly Nice" was the first play acted before JAMES II, and held the stage for nearly a century. CROWNE continued to write for the stage and brood over his grievance. In the dedicatory epistle to "The English Lover" (1690) and to "Caligula" (1698), he claims that he has been "robbed of his patrimony." In 1697-8 he made his last fruitless effort to recover the land in dispute.⁸ It was at this time that Document 62 was drawn up. This is a very clear, full and circumstantial statement of the facts which we have gleaned from TEMPLE's letters and the "Case of William Crowne" (Document 55). It adds this particular: that TEMPLE had no right to surrender Penobscot to the French, as it had never formed part of Nova Scotia proper. Two of TEMPLE's letters confirm this assertion. In 1668, when he is fighting tooth and nail for anything that could be saved out of the wreck, he writes to the Committee of Trade and Plantations, refusing to surrender Penobscot to the French *because* it forms part of New England territory. At this time CROWNE senior was dead, TEMPLE was sole patentee, and had no end to serve in concealing the truth. As early as 1658 (Document 19), Temple mentions having agreed with CROWNE for a portion of the land that formerly belonged to the Plymouth patent. The question of boundaries was and long continued to be a fruitful source of annoyance and dis-

⁷ *History of New England*, iii, p. 431, note.

⁸ The province had been taken from the French by PHIPS, in his expedition against Quebec in 1690.

pute, and hence it is easy to understand how opposing claims could be maintained so obstinately and with so much show of reason. This last effort of CROWNE's was as luckless as the others. It was made just before the final humiliation of LOUIS XIV by WILLIAM III; the treaty of Ryswick in the same year (1697) handed back to France the entire province. The last reference to CROWNE is in 1703, in which year he probably died, about the age of sixty-three, according to my computation.

Of CROWNE's character and the quality of his plays, I have very little to say. From the tone of his dedications, from passages in his works, as well as from independent testimony, I judge that he was a typical Restoration dramatist, a clever, corrupt, court lickspittle. "Sir Courtly Nice," his best comedy, is well constructed, abounds in effective situations, in well-defined, if farcical personages, and in dialogue that would not now be tolerated in a brothel. This is also true of "The Country Wit." As a man and a play-wright, he deserves little consideration; but this is not to say that his claims to property in America were unfounded. When the character of TEMPLE is considered, the evidence of his letters, and CROWNE's strange persistence in his suit through twenty years, it seems to me at least impossible to resist the conclusion that Documents 55 and 62, although statements of plaintiffs in the case, are in every particular correct. Through the rascality of his father's partner, and the meanness of his King, CROWNE was without question "robbed" of his patrimony.

ARCHIBALD MACMECHAN.

Dalhousie College, Halifax, N. S.

Dante's Treatise "De Vulgari Eloquentiâ," translated into English with explanatory notes by A. G. FERRERS HOWELL, LL. M. of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1891. 12mo, pp. xxi, 131.

In this book we have the first English translation of DANTE'S "De Vulgari Eloquentiâ." After the vast amount of speculation that has been indulged in, for the last six hundred

years, the opinion has gradually found favor that perhaps, after all, the very best key to an understanding of DANTE and of his great Comedy, is to be found in what are generally called his minor works. Any attempt, therefore, to make more accessible any of these treatises—which are by no means easy reading in the original—is most praiseworthy.¹

The treatise "De Vulgari Eloquentiâ" was first printed in an Italian translation at Vicenza in 1529, anonymously, according to FRATICELLI; but it was afterwards discovered to be by TRISSINO, the author of "Sofonisba"; the edition in the original Latin not appearing till 1577 in Paris. To the edition of TRISSINO's translation published at Milan in 1868, is prefixed a curious letter of MANZONI's with a rejoinder by GINO CAPPONI "riguardanti ambidue il quesito 'qual sia il vero argomento del *Volgare Eloquio*,'" in which MANZONI says:

"Al libro *De Vulgari Eloquio* è toccata una sorte, non nova nel suo genere, ma sempre curiosa e notevole; quella, cioè, d'esser citato da molti, e non letto quasi da nessuno, quantunque libro di ben piccola mole, e quantunque importante, non solo per l'altissima fama del suo autore, ma perchè fu ed è citato come quello che sciogla un'imbarazzata e imbarazzante questione, stabilendo e dimostrando quale sia la lingua italiana."

The reason for its not being read, he says, "sara probabilmente perchè le persone del giorno d'oggi suppongono che i loro padri o i loro nonni, da cui hanno la cosa per tradizione, l'abbiano letto loro" (p. x). CAPPONI's argument, however, that "riguardo alla questione della lingua italiana, quel libro è fuor de' concerti, perchè in esso non si tratta di lingua italiana nè punto nè poco," is sufficiently answered by GIULIANI.²

This treatise "On the Vulgar Tongue," which

¹ Within the last four years two English translations of DANTE'S "Convito" have appeared. The first in 1887 by ELIZABETH PRICE SAYER, London: Routledge; and a better one in 1889, by KATHRINE HILLIARD, London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

² Le Opere Latine di Dante Allighieri reintegrate nel testo con nuovi commenti da Giambattista Giuliani (Firenze, 1878), vol. i, p. 12 et seq., where he defines *Eloquentiâ* in the title to mean "Facoltà del ben dire, e che indi tutto il libro deve pregiarsi come un "Trattato didottrina del ben dire in *Volgare*."